

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated December 15, 2006. Claims 1-2, 4-8 and 10-26 are pending.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kim '144 in view of Kim '388. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 as amended requires that “a depth D of the light-shielding layer satisfies a relationship $D + T_3/2 = \sqrt{3} \times P/2$, where D is a depth of the light-shielding layer, T_3 is a thickness of the liquid crystal layer, and P is a pitch of an arrangement of at least some of the protrusions and openings.” For example support, see paragraph [0075] of the instant specification. For example and without limitation, paragraph [0075] and Fig. 6 of the instant application explain that providing a depth in accordance with the above equation is advantageous in that effective shading of desired liquid crystal regions 31 may be realized in a more efficient manner.

Kim '144 and Kim '388 fails to disclose or suggest the aforesaid underlined features of amended claim 1.

Claims 8, 22 and 23 also require that a depth D of the light-shield layer satisfies a relationship $D + T_3/2 = \sqrt{3} \times P/2$, where D is a depth of the light-shield layer, T_3 is a thickness of the liquid crystal layer, and P is a pitch of an arrangement of the protrusions and openings. Again, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest these features of claims 8, 22 and 23.

Claims 14 and 26 require that the light-shield layer is located at a central area of a corresponding pixel of the display device and does not cover an edge of the pixel and does not cover any gate or data line. For example and without limitation, Figs. 1B, 17 and 18 of the instant application illustrate that the light shield layer (40, 41) is located at a central area of a


pixel and does not cover an edge of a pixel or any gate/data line. Kim '144 fails to disclose or suggest this, and instead teaches directly away from this feature. In particular, Kim '144 in Fig. 16 and at col. 11, lines 7-9, teaches that the BM is provided at the *outer* edge of the pixel electrode in order to shield the *outside* of the pixel regions, thereby teaching the *opposite* of what amended claims 14 and 26 require. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 14 and 26 define over the cited art for at least the above reason.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: _____



Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100